



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,311	02/22/2006	Paul S. Cohen	I-2003.009 US	2438
31846	7590	12/31/2008	EXAMINER	
Intervet/Schering-Plough Animal Health PATENT DEPARTMENT PO BOX 318 29160 Intervet Lane MILLSBORO, DE 19966-0318			DUFFY, PATRICIA ANN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1645		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	12/31/2008	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/569,311	COHEN, PAUL S.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Patricia A. Duffy	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

### RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

The amendment and response filed 9-23-08 has been entered into the record.

Claims 1-11 and 13 have been cancelled. Claim 12 is pending and under examination.

The text of Title 35 of the U.S. Code not reiterated herein can be found in the previous office action.

#### *Rejections Withdrawn*

The rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific, substantial and credible or well established asserted utility or a well established utility is withdrawn based on the amendment to the claims.

The rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific, substantial, and credible or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention is withdrawn based on the amendment to the claims.

The rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn based on the amendment to the claims.

#### *New Rejections Based on Amendment*

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims are drawn to the use of a live attenuated *Salmonella* bacterium not having a functional tRNA5 leu for inducing a protective immune response against the genus

Art Unit: 1645

of *Salmonella* bacteria. This claim encompasses both homologous protection (i.e. protection from the same species of attenuated live bacterium) and heterologous protection (protection across the genus afforded to different *Salmonella* species and serotypes). The genus of *Salmonella* species are minimally set forth on page 6, liens 4-9 of the specification. The specification asserts protection but provides no experimental data indicating cross-species and cross-serotype protection.

The dictionary definition of vaccine is "A prophylactic or therapeutic material containing antigens derived from one or more pathogenic organisms which, on administration to man or animal, will stimulate active immunity and protect against infection with these or related organism (i.e. produce protective immunity)." (The Dictionary of Immunology, Herbert et al eds, Academic Press, 1995) would clearly realize the critical deficiency of this specification with respect to vaccines. There is absolutely no demonstration of protective immunity upon administration in any animal model of disease. It is well recognized in the vaccine art, that it is unclear whether an antigen(s) derived from a pathogen will elicit protective immunity. Ellis, R.W. (Chapter 29 of "VACCINES" [Plotkin, S.A. et al. (eds) published by W. B. Saunders company (Philadelphia) in 1988, especially page 571, 2nd full paragraph] exemplifies this problem in the recitation that "The key to the problem (of vaccine development) is the identification of that protein component of a virus or microbial pathogen that itself can elicit the production of protective antibodies.... and thus protect the host against attack by the pathogen". The art is replete with evidence that the ability to produce an antibody (immunogenicity) is insufficient to correlate with protection from infection. See for example Feng et al (Infection and Immunity, 64(1):363-365, 1996) that teaches that P55, is an immunogenic but nonprotective 55-kilodalton *Borrelia burdorferi*/protein in murine lyme disease. Chandrashekhar et al (US Patent 6,248,329) teach that "Although many investigators have tried to develop vaccines based on specific antigens, it is well understood that the ability of an antigen to simulated antibody productions does not necessarily correlate with the

Art Unit: 1645

ability of the antigen to stimulate an immune response capable of protecting an animal from infection..." (column 1, lines 35-41). As such, one skilled in the art would have reason to doubt the claimed live attenuated *Salmonella* bacterium has the ability to generate a protective immune response across the genus of *Salmonella* species as now claimed.

In the absence of a teaching of the claimed live attenuated *Salmonella* is effective in prevention of disease across different species of *Salmonella*, the specification is not be enabled for vaccines. In view of the unpredictability of the art, the lack of teachings of the specification, it would require undue experimentation on the part of the skilled artisan to practice the invention as claimed.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim recites "... a live attenuated *Salmonella* bacterium..." is indefinite because *Salmonella* is a genus and not a bacterium. Bacteria are designated by a genus and specie name, the claim only recites a genus which is not a specifically identified bacterium as indicated in the claims. As such, the claims lack precision.

#### *Status of Claims*

Claim 12 stands rejected.

#### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia A. Duffy whose telephone number is 571-272-0855. The examiner can generally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 6:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisors, Robert Mondesi can be reached at 571-272-0956.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/569,311  
Art Unit: 1645

Page 6

/Patricia A. Duffy/

Primary Examiner